

**In The Claims:**

Please cancel claim 21 without prejudice or disclaimer as to the subject matter recited therein. Please replace claims 1, 12, and 16 with the amended claims below. A "marked-up" version of each amendment is included in Attachment A.

1. (Twice Amended) A method for fabricating a metallization structure, comprising:

ion metal plasma depositing a wetting layer within a cavity of a dielectric layer;

applying a sufficient bias power to splash deposited metal at the bottom of the cavity to sidewalls of the cavity, wherein said applying occurs at least partly during said ion metal plasma depositing the wetting layer; and

sputter depositing, within a single chamber, substantially an entirety of a bulk metal layer upon the wetting layer.

12. (Twice Amended) A method for fabricating a metallization structure, comprising:

in a first deposition chamber, ion metal plasma depositing a wetting layer consisting essentially of titanium within a cavity in a dielectric layer above a microelectronic topography;

in a second deposition chamber, sputter depositing at a first temperature a first portion of a bulk metal layer comprising aluminum upon and in contact with the wetting layer; subsequently

in said second deposition chamber, sputter depositing at a second temperature a second portion of the bulk metal layer within the cavity; and subsequently

in said second deposition chamber, sputter depositing at a third temperature a third portion of the bulk metal layer upon said second portion, wherein said third temperature is lower than the second temperature.

16. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 12, wherein said sputter depositing at the second temperature further comprises depositing the second portion of the bulk metal layer upon the first portion of the bulk metal layer.

#### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 12, and 16 have been amended. Claim 21 has been canceled. Thus, claims 1-18 and 22-30 are currently pending in the case. Further examination and reconsideration of the presently claimed application is respectfully requested.

#### **Interview Summary:**

In an telephone interview on November 26, 2001 between Examiner Gregg Cantelmo and Patent Agent Mollie Hamel, it was indicated that the references cited in response to the previous Office Action mailed July 12, 2001 were used to support the use of claim language used in the application. As such, the references were not submitted as references to be considered with regard to the teachings of the presently claimed case. It was requested that the Examiner cite the references on form PTO 892 if the Examiner deems such references to be pertinent to the teachings of the presently claimed case. Issues discussed during the telephone interview may be further referred to in the appropriate section below.

#### **Election/Restriction of Claims:**

Claims 24-30 were withdrawn from consideration in the Office Action for being directed to a non-elected invention. It is asserted that restriction is proper only when the restricted inventions are independently or patentably distinct, *see* MPEP 803. A burden exists for the Examiner to provide reasons and/or examples to support any conclusions that restriction is proper, MPEP 803. Sufficient reasons and/or examples were not provided in the Office Action